

NOV 29 1965

Approved For Release 1999/09/17 : CIA-RDP75-00149

STATINTL

# U.S. 'No' to Ghana . . .

By William S. White

## A Hint of a New Aid Policy

THE COUNTRY involved is little and unimportant and so, relatively, is the amount of money at issue. Nevertheless, the implications of the blunt rejection by the United States of the request of Ghana for \$100 million worth of American surplus food are large, indeed.



White

The incident casts a long shadow which recipients of American foreign aid everywhere would do well to heed.

For the decision not to go on giving handouts to the tinpot dictator of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah, while he continues to abuse the United States—as so long he has done without effective rebuke from Washington—breaks new ground in the whole policy of foreign aid. It means that while the United States will indeed tolerate much ingratitude, somewhere there is, after all, a limit.

It is the beginning of the end for an absurd article of faith which through four Administrations and nearly two decades has bedeviled the aid program. The effect

of this credo has been not simply that the United States must never, never demand the support of those nations it assisted but actually that the nastier they got toward us the more we must give them. Why? Well, we must show at all costs that "there are no strings on foreign aid."

GHANA provided a hard test for a new determination to put some rationality into this business. For Ghana is, of course, in Africa. Ghana is a "newly emerging state," a dandy "independent" country freed at long last from the evil clutches of colonialism.

Ghana, in short, is among what had heretofore been the untouchables. It has always been all right for us to get impatient with our old Allies in the West. Up to now it has been considered unthinkable to allow any provocation, short of imminent murder of our nationals, to lead up to being impatient with anybody in Africa.

That this Government has at last told off Nkrumah's Ghana, therefore, is an evolution of the most capital importance. It marks the first time, but for the incident in which President Johnson sent aircraft to rescue white hostages fac-

ing massacre in the Congo for being white, that the United States Government has ever dared to admit itself to be fed up with African extremism.

THE DECISION was long in coming, too long, in the view of one columnist. Nkrumah had been allowed to establish, in his "independent" state, a tyranny so brutal as to make the very worst old days of colonialism look positively kind by comparison.

But, ironically, he has finally passed the extreme limits of tolerance by writing a book—a book on "neo-colonialism" so ugly, so malicious, so savagely false and so bitterly hostile to the United States as sadly to convince even his old apologists in this country that he could no longer be regarded as a responsible head of state.

His mistake was to go quite beyond automatic attacks upon the American Central Intelligence Agency, the universal whipping boy of every foreign interest which wants to play the Communist game while eagerly accepting our economic assistance. Not only did he offer the usual and routine slanders of the CIA; he hit the most gentle and pacific of our instrumental-

ties, the Peace Corps, no less.

There is a certain sour humor in all this, at that. For when Nkrumah decided to accuse the Peace Corps of being hand in glove with the alleged cloak-and-dagger machinations of the poor old CIA he did more than put forward an accusation of towering absurdity. Worse yet, he lost even his most soft-minded supporters within that group in this country which invariably elevates to the status of angels all nations that have broken out of the bonds of "colonialism."

© 1965, United Features Syndicate

CPYRGHT